OVEMBER, 1958
Vol. 42 • No. 2

DEC - 9 1958

The HIGH SCHOOL JOURNAL

REFERENCE

THE CHICAGO PUBLIC LIBRARY
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

The HIGH SCHOOL JOURNAL

SAMUEL M. HOLTON, *Editor*
Associate Professor of Education, University of North Carolina

WILLIAM P. MATTHEWS, *Assistant Editor*
Assistant Professor of Education, University of North Carolina

EDITORIAL BOARD

L. O. ARMSTRONG
R. L. BEARD
E. C. BOLMEIER
JOHN B. CHASE, JR.
A. B. COMBS
O. K. CORNWELL
HARRIS W. DEAN
CATHERINE T. DENNIS
G. GORDON ELLIS
ALBERT J. GEIGER
J. MINOR GWYNN
J. T. HUNT
W. M. JENKINS
A. M. JORDAN
A. K. KING
FRANKLIN H. MCNUTT
J. R. MELTON
ARNOLD PERRY
E. L. PHILLIPS
GUY B. PHILLIPS
CLINTON R. PREWETT
LUTHER R. TAFF
DONALD G. TARBET

Published Monthly, October through May, by the University of North Carolina Press for the School of Education of the University of North Carolina. *Subscription Price $2.00; clubs of five to nine, $1.75 each; clubs of ten or more, $1.50 each; single copies, 40c.*

Subscriptions and Advertising are handled through the University of North Carolina Press in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, to which communications pertaining to business details should be addressed. Entered at Second-Class Matter, March 1, 1918, at Post Office at Chapel Hill, N. C., under Act of March 3, 1879.

All other communications, articles submitted for publication, and books submitted for review should be sent to *Editor, High School Journal,* Box 810, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

The HIGH SCHOOL JOURNAL

Vol. XLII ✕ November, 1958 ✕ No 2

IN THIS ISSUE

Providing for the Gifted.....*William H. Morgan* 34

Good Buy, Mr. Chips?.....*June Diemer* 45

The Teaching of Morality in the Public School..*Edward Locke* 49

What Kinds of Accidents Do Teenagers Have?.....*Lillian Haygood* 53

Book Reviews..... 62

THE CONTENTS OF THIS HIGH SCHOOL JOURNAL ARE LISTED IN "EDUCATION INDEX"

Issued Monthly, October to May, Inclusive $2.00 a Year

Published by the University of North Carolina Press for the School of Education of the University of North Carolina.

SAMUEL M. HOLTON, *Editor*

Editorial Office: Box 810, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Business Office: Box 510, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Providing for the Gifted

WILLIAM H. MORGAN
Darlington School, Rome, Georgia

OCTOBER 4, 1957, marks an important date on the world's calendar. This date, of course, is the date of the launching of man's first satellite by Russia. This launching caused a chain reaction which triggered the launching of perhaps the most severe attack ever made by critics of the American system of public education. America "lost face" in the race to be the first to accomplish this satellite feat, and her leaders in all fields turned for a quick analysis to find the sources of the failure. Some of these men who came up with quickest answers had their fingers pointed scornfully at the public school. All in the twinkle of an eye these men heroically discovered, tore apart, and laid before the feet of the American people the traitor to the democratic cause—the American system of education.

In the field of education there apparently was shelter for no one from the "fall-out" of criticism following the "explosion." All phases of education from teacher training to teaching methods were rocked by the repercussion.

There is no doubt in the mind of this writer that if the United States had reached this milestone in science one day ahead of Russia, the greatest part of this criticism would never have come about. These critics, in their haste to find someone at fault, failed to remember that the American system of education was not founded on the philosophy of world domination, nor was it founded to compete with other nations in the output of superior numbers of scientists. However, regardless of the many half truths and misconstrued statistics and information quoted by the critics, much good has come from the effects of their criticism. Education has received a shot in the arm which helped to revitalize the entire system.

If any one part of the criticism were extracted and taken to be the keynote of all the critics, it would be the lack of attention given to the gifted child. Wilson illustrates this by saying, "Studies show that brilliant children in this country are nowhere near as advanced in the sciences as their opposite numbers in Europe or Russia."[1] The editors of *Life* magazine further state:

[1] Sloan Wilson, "It's Time to Close Our Carnivals," *Life* (Special issue, "Crisis In Education"), 14.

> Where there are young minds of great promise, there are rarely the means to advance them. The nation's stupid children get far better care than the bright. The geniuses of the next decades are even now being allowed to dip back into mediocrity.[2]

These editors stated also that there were many communities which opposed any special program for the gifted while, at the same time, the same communities were spending generously on much more costly programs for the retarded.

Without a doubt, there is a great deal of exaggeration and misrepresentation in these statements; but, at the same time, there is a resounding ring of truth in them. This flurry of criticism has brought to the forefront a problem with which educators have been battling for half a century—that is, providing for the intellectually gifted. Recent surveys indicate that a good portion of the nation's gifted children fail to go to college. One report found that about seven percent fail to finish high school, about fourteen percent fail to go to college, and only seventy-six percent of those who go to college finish. As adults many are engaged in vocations which do not utilize their talents. Since one of America's greatest resources lies in her gifted children, there is no doubt that a good portion of this resource is not being developed.

Preliminary to organizing a program at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Superintendent Parker sent out questionnaires to determine the types of programs being offered for the gifted children. He sent these questionnaires to the state superintendents of all forty-eight states. Of the thirty-one answers that he received, eight replied that there were no planned programs, and twenty-three listed from one to six systems which had planned programs. He found also that the number of colleges and universities offering courses and workshops for the training of teachers for gifted children was negligible.[3] Although these data are two or three years old and much progress has been made since then, there still remains much to be done in the area of providing for the bright child. The critics are clamoring for a greater output of scientists and engineers to balance in sheer numbers the production by Russia. Of this Behnke states:

> It is pertinent here to digress a moment to comment on the current hubbub about the reports that we are being outstripped by the Russians in the number of scientists and engineers being trained in schools. We should be concerned, but our greatest concern should not be on the quantitative level, but on the qualita-

[2] Editors, "The Waste of Fine Minds," *Life* (Special issue, "Crisis In Education"), 1.
[3] Clyde Parker, "A Measured Experiment With Advanced Children" *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 133 (December, 1956), 23.

tive; not on how many but how good; not on how much they know, but how creatively they can use what they know. Our superiority has been and is primarily in technology, not in basic science which is the lifeblood of progress in both science and technology. It is in technological competence that the Russians are most likely to overtake and even pass us. If we can educate superior students in depth, we can produce fundamental advances upon which significant technological developments depend.[4]

As Behnke aptly puts it, our pressing concern should be on qualitative learning and not quantitative, which means better provision for those who are capable of deeper and more thorough learning.

THE PROBLEM OF IDENTIFICATION

One of the primary reasons that most schools are failing to meet the needs of the gifted child is that the teachers themselves have not learned to recognize or appreciate fully the abilities of the gifted children. While also there is a certain amount of traditional misconception concerning the intellectually gifted child, in the past it was generally believed that the gifted child was eccentric, queer, or emotionally unstable. Some had the idea that the extent of genius was proportionate to the amount of instability. The general feeling that genius and eccentricity were inseparable is probably one of the reasons that it has taken people in general so many years to accept the individual of extremely high intelligence.

General Characteristics. Instead of finding the maladjusted, eccentric weakling to be characteristic of the highly gifted child, most researches have found him to be more nearly the opposite of this description. Terman and Oden, after studies of gifted youth covering 25 years, reported that the gifted child was attractive and well-rounded, and not the physical weakling and social misfit which people formerly conceived him to be.[5] Physically, the bright child has been found to be taller and heavier than other students of the same age. As Adams and Brown suggest, the misconception that the gifted child was smaller and weaker probably had its origin in the practice of acceleration. The gifted child is generally slightly stronger and his health is just as good as the health of his peer group. Mentally, he has been found to have a much greater ability to carry on abstract thinking, make generalizations, use critical thinking, understand and carry out directions, solve difficult problems, and to use insight and reasoning in the understanding of prob-

[4] John A. Behnke, "The Challenge of Science to Schools," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 134 (March, 1957), 39.

[5] Fay Adams and Walker Brown, *Teaching the Bright Pupil* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930), p. 18.

lems or situations. The gifted child is found to have more initiative, creative ability, and foresight. He has an unlimited range of interest and curiosity; he shows more persistence when working on difficult assignments, and he learns with considerable ease and speed. Socially, he is found to have a high degree of moral stability. Generally the gifted child is rated higher in trustworthiness and reliability. And, contrary to popular belief, he is usually socially adaptable, taking a great interest in other people.[6,7]

Methods of Identification. In order that some program might be set up to provide for the gifted, there must be first some means of making accurate identification of these students. Paul Witty lists four means by which the gifted may be identified.[8] These are (1) IQ tests, (2) teacher observation and evaluation, (3) grades on various subjects, and (4) scores on standardized exams in subject areas. There will be very few systems which use exactly the same methods for identification, nor will any wise administrator or supervisor use only one method or technique. Probably the most prevailing method is the use of IQ tests. This is perhaps the quickest and the least complicated of all the methods. Any testing system is subject to error; thus, test results must be handled with discretion. Often it is wise to retest with other IQ tests. Even retesting with the same test will often times indicate errors. As Adams and Brown state, "A difference of five points is generally conceded as a reasonable possibility of error in results."[9] And they further state that ". . . the original accuracy of a group test of general intelligence is not great enough to warrant a close differentiation between individual scores."[10] Used by competent personnel, the IQ test can be an effective and efficient tool in the identification procedures. Cutts and Moseley suggest a principle to follow in the use of tests: "A high rating with regard to one or several criteria generally indicates high ability, but a low rating does not necessarily indicate low ability."[11]

Teacher observation and evaluation will often times corroborate the findings of the IQ test. However, it has been proven that teachers are many times mistaken in their evaluation of students; consequently, this method may not be as accurate as testing, but it may serve as an excellent supplement in the identification of the

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[7] Norma E. Cutts and Nicholas Moseley, *Teaching the Bright and Gifted* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 17.
[8] Paul Witty and Samuel Bloom, "Education of the Gifted," *School and Society*, Vol. 78 (October 17, 1953), p. 113.
[9] Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] Cutts, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

gifted. Another disadvantage of this method is that often teachers realize their inability to judge accurately and are very reluctant to accept the responsibility for making any decisions or choices. This, however, is a minor obstacle and should not preclude the use of this method.

In the use of grades made in various classes, consideration must be made for the human variables involved in the acquisition of those grades. Such items as teacher-pupil relationship, teaching methods, knowledge requirements for the grade, teacher's philosophy of grading and other factors tend to influence the grades. Consistency of grades in most subject areas is a fairly stable criterion to follow when using this method. Using the same principle as testing, consistency will fairly accurately prove the ability of a student; but, conversely, inconsistency will not prove inability.

Standardized tests in subject areas can be another excellent supplementary means for identifying the gifted child if, of course, the tests are used intelligently. The tests must be carefully selected in terms of the subjects and materials which the student has covered.

These are not the only methods which may be used to identify the gifted child, but they embody or imply most of the other current practices. Regardless of the technique used, it is most important that the identification be made as early as possible.

METHODS OF PROVISION

All too frequently educators and laymen do not realize that the same opportunity for all is not equality of opportunity for each individual. A curriculum which may explore the interests, aptitudes and capacities of one child may reveal little to another. Many states and communities are coming to realize their democratic obligation to make some provision for the trainable retarded children, and many states have already passed laws stipulating provision for these retarded youngsters. However, as has already been pointed out, these same states and communities fail to visualize any responsibility toward the gifted child. Many citizens feel that any special attention given the gifted is undemocratic and is an attempt toward social stratification. These people argue that the intellectually gifted child has the ability to learn for himself and will develop with or without help. There is no doubt that the gifted child will learn in spite of everything else; but this, of course, is not the problem. In the American system of education we are attempting to educate all of the children of all of the people, wherein the strength of the nation lies. Our philosophy of education is

to develop each child to the fullest extent of his capability, and if a child is left to drift and to develop within his own means, then his chances of self-realization are almost nil. A child, gifted or retarded, cannot be expected to develop in a curriculum that is not adapted to his particular needs.

As always typical of education, even when there is unity in the realization of the need to provide for the gifted children, there is no unity of opinion as to what approach should be taken or what methods of provisions should be made. Many different methods have been suggested, and many different methods are now in operation in school systems across the nation; and, according to the opinions of many authorities, no particular system will work for all schools nor will one method work all of the time for one particular school. Thus, adjustments will have to be made to meet the needs of the different situations in the different school systems. For the purpose of discussion in this paper the writer grouped the major types of provision under three headings which are (1) acceleration, (2) enrichment through the regular classroom, and (3) grouping. The other methods which are not used as extensively are discussed under the fourth heading "other methods."

Acceleration. This program has been used rather extensively and successfully; but, at the same time, it has many foes. Opponents of acceleration use as their major weapon the claim of social damage as a result of placing younger students with older students. They claim that acceleration leads to social maladjustment and many frustrations, both academic and social in origin. In the past it was often pointed out that a gifted child would not be capable of keeping up with older students academically and would not be capable of doing college work. However, surveys and researches have tended to disprove this supposition. Pressey conducted one such study and concluded that younger entrants to college were more likely to graduate, had the best academic records, won the most honors, and presented the lowest disciplinary difficulties. Holmes in a study at Harvard University in 1913 found that the younger entrants did better work with less friction. Jones in a study at Columbia University found a clear correlation between lower age of admission and higher scholarship. Alltucker in a study of 308 gifted students from Berkeley High School found that the younger gifted graduates did better than the average state-wide student, and she also found that the younger gifted students did as well as the older gifted. Other men who did similar studies and got similar results were as follows: Pittenger, University of Minne-

sota; Husband, Dartmouth; Wilson, Oklahoma; Whinery, Ohio State University; Zeigel, University of Missouri; and Gray, Barnard College.[12] Other studies in adjustment, social and academic, also gave positive results. Trusler recommended more frequent grade skipping for pupils of 125 IQ or above. Of this Witty states, "This recommendation seems to be in accord with suggestions drawn from genetic studies which show that acceleration in the elementary school up to two full grades is not associated with undersirable later adjustment in the gifted."[13] Alltucker in a survey of 135 pupils who were accelerated from two to seven semesters found that 82 percent of these felt that they were in no way out of harmony with the school group.[14] The editors of *Life* further comment, ". . . studies show that, except in isolated cases, bright pupils quickly adjust to working with older classmates, and that it does far more psychological damage to hold them back."[15] As a final note on the case for acceleration, the writer submits a quotation from Cutts and Moseley:

> As a group, the younger subjects have had greater vocational success, and they have adjusted to adult life at least as well emotionally and socially as the older group. Terman concludes that, whatever the disadvantages of acceleration may be, they are usually temporary and would be even fewer if more bright young people advanced more rapidly through school.[16]

One of the practices of acceleration is that of early admission to kindergarten, and subsequently to the first grade. The New Haven, Connecticut, public schools began experimenting with this in 1922 and developed a successful program.

Many systems are combining the primary group into ungraded classes and allowing the pupil to progress at his own rate. Milwaukee has a program such as this. Superintendent Washburne of Winnetka, Illinois, set up a program whereby a child works individually and can cover the material in a time commensurate with his own ability. The Dalton Plan (Massachusetts) is based on the same plan as the Winnetka Plan. In this plan courses are differentiated on various levels of achievement by means of contract. The child selects his contract and completes it either individually or in a group.

The Ford Foundation organized the Program for Early Admission to College in which three preparatory schools and three colleges collaborated to allow a student to finish eight years' work in

[12] Margaret Moore, *A Study of Young High School Graduates* (Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1933), p. 15.
[13] Witty, *op. cit.*, p. 114.
[14] Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
[15] Editors, *Life*, *loc. cit.*

seven years. Baltimore's Robert E. Lee Junior High School students cover three years' work in two years.

Other methods of acceleration are as listed below:

(1) Allowing the gifted students to take extra classes.
(2) Admission of the gifted students to college with advanced standing.
(3) Allowing the students to attend summer school.
(4) Skipping grades, especially in the elementary grades.

Enrichment Through the Regular Classroom. Regardless of the type of organization used for teaching the gifted, enrichment is a part of it. Wherever the gifted child is taught, the teaching methods and materials must be enriched to challenge the depth and breadth of the gifted child's capacity. For the sake of clarification, when the writer uses the term "enrichment" in this discussion, it will refer only to enrichment as it pertains itself to the regular classroom (non-segregated or non-grouped).

Quoting Cutts and Moseley on enrichment:

> Enrichment does entail a great deal of time and effort on the teacher's part if it is to be beneficial to each pupil. There must be careful consideration of general objectives and of how these are served by what each pupil does, the teacher must study the shortcomings of each pupil, his capabilities, and his interests and then plan carefully to be sure that he benefits. The pupil must be given a large part in making plans, but the teacher has to take time to confer with him and to check on his progress. All of which means work, enormously interesting and rewarding work.[17]

This latter statement by Cutts and Moseley seems to be one of the key arguments against enrichment. That is, in the modern classroom where conditions are generally crowded, there does not seem to be enough time for the teacher to accomplish what is called for in the caring for individual students. Witty states, "It is generally conceded that a satisfactory device for providing for the gifted within the classroom is differentiated assignments."[18] However, he concludes that this is too difficult to do with large classes with different levels of ability.

Other opponents of enrichment programs feel that if a gifted child is left in the regular classroom, he will be competing against students with far less ability; and, consequently, he cannot be properly stimulated or challenged.

However, this method of provision is one of the most widely used techniques. Some schools systems use it of necessity because

[16] Cutts and Moseley, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] Witty, *loc. cit.*

of the limited facilities and teachers. This writer would venture to say that size of the schools is the foremost reason for the widespread use of enrichment in the regular classroom. Even so, there are many educators in large systems who justify their use of enrichment by the theory that only the regular classroom provides a lifelike situation in which all types of students and all levels of abilities are found. They feel that this is the only democratic way of providing for the gifted.

An enrichment program does not mean simply the giving of an additional amount of work over and above that of the average students. It entails the techniques of creative writing, research, study of civic problems, special reports, excursions, experiments, use of community resources, and other methods which will call upon the resourcefulness and ability of the gifted child.

Cutts and Moseley offer the following objectives of enrichment:[19]

(1) Challenge the full use of abilities.
(2) Broaden the base of knowledge.
(3) Deepen understanding.
(4) Increase the level of skills.
(5) Develop a love of understanding.
(6) Inculcate desirable methods of learning, thinking, and sharing.
(7) Encourage initiative.
(8) Give play to creativity.

It might be pointed out here that these objectives are easily applicable to any method used in the provision for the intellectually gifted child.

Because of the widespread use of enrichment in the regular classroom, the writer will not give any illustrations of current practices.

Grouping. Ability grouping has been proven to be a successful method of providing for the gifted child. However, like the other methods, it has many opponents. Some administrators and lay citizens feel that it will entail extra expenses. As has already been pointed out, some communities will make provision for retarded children, but, ironically, feel that it is undemocratic to make provision for special classes for the bright children. Others who object feel that considerable social damage can be done by segregating the gifted children from the average and subnormal children. They

[19] Cutts and Moseley, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

feel that placing these students in special classes will tend to make them egotistical. More objections of grouping might come from teachers who are requested to help make the selections for the classes.

Favoring ability grouping, Coy states:

> If a highly gifted child is left in the ordinary classroom, he wastes a large amount of time; he is likely to develop habits of laziness and lack of perserverance; he may occupy his unused time in mischief which interferes with others' work, and which forms in the gifted child selfiish and thoughtless habits; he may lose interest in his work; he may grow very conceited; his high achievement may set him so apart from his fellows that he becomes self-conscious, badly adjusted and "queer"; he is a source of discouragement and envy to the average and dull. On the other hand, if the bright child is placed in a class where all the children are very bright he ceases to waste time; he saves it, and therefore may have to spend a shorter time in the elementary school; he can be given a broader culture; he can be given more concrete experience with the world he lives in; he can be trained to express himself convincingly in writing and speaking; he can gradually be educated in social attitudes of responsibility, initiative and cooperation which will eventually make him a man fit to be a leader in a "true democracy."[20]

In refuting the argument that the segregated class does not offer life-like environment, Cohen and Coryell state ". . . we believe that there is no validity in the argument that by segregation one creates artificial conditions in the classroom and the school. In our professions and vocations we compete not with everyone but with a selected group."[21] Stedman reports that after five years of experience with gifted children there is no doubt in her mind as to the value of segregating gifted children.[22] Certainly there are more advantages for the gifted children in special classes. The teaching process and the learning process become easier because the learning situation is not confused. Here the bright students have an opportunity to stimulate each other, exchange ideas, give and take criticism, and share research. Here the gifted child has a better democratic opportunity to develop to his ultimate limit.

One of the plans in operation is at the Colfax School in Pittsburgh. Here the gifted students spend fifty percent of their time in workshops and the other fifty percent in regular classroom, the idea being to give the child an opportunity to work with students of his own ability and still associate with all types of students. Cleveland's Major Work Classes have been in existence for more than

[20] Genevieve Coy, *The Interests, Abilities and Achievements of a Special Class for Gifted Children* (Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1923), p. 14.
[21] Helen Cohen and Nancy Coryell, *Educating Superior Students* (American Book Company; New York, 1935), p. 16.
[22] Lulu Stedman, *Education of Gifted Children* (World Book Company: Chicago, 1924), p. 19.

thirty years. The program is in charge of a special supervisor and the student must score a minimum of 125 IQ on the Stanford-Binet. Art, music, and foreign language enrich the curriculum, and units of work are used. In the University City, Missouri, elementary schools, special classes meet from forty to fifty minutes twice a week. Pupils are chosen on the basis of classwork, school marks, and over-all performance as shown by the permanent record. Classroom methods emphasize discussion and research. Riley reports the system that is used in the Twin Lakes School, Tampa, Florida.[23] This experiment is carried on in the sixth grade. Four levels are used in the grouping: (1) gifted group, (2) high average, (3) low average, and (4) slow learners. As a basis of selection, general achievement is used. This is based on standardized tests and teacher judgment as indicated by the cumulative record. Other items which are considered are reading ability, and creative ability. A committee of four teachers and the principal make the final selection. According to Riley, their experience has been that everyone profits from the program.

Other Methods. Most programs will include some form of one of the three methods already mentioned or some combination of the three. An extension of the idea of grouping is that of the special schools such as New York has in science, music and art, performing arts, and science and technology. In large city systems this can be an excellent way of meeting the needs of the gifted. Another method which has been used with a great deal of success is the special club such as the science, math, debating, history, dramatics and photography club. Effectively used these clubs may have a strong influence on the gifted child's work. Other co-curricular experiences such as the assembly program committee, student council, traffic squad, social committee, and service committees all afford a richer background for the more capable students. Extra classes after school whenever possible can do much toward helping the gifted. Obviously, this method has its disadvantages. Also programs have been organized whereby the school counselor works directly with the gifted children, guiding and directing them.

The last, but by no means the least, method to be discussed in other methods is the plan as offered by Dr. James B. Conant, known as the "Conant Plan." This plan could readily be placed under the heading of "grouping," but this writer felt that it deserved a separate section. Dr. Conant, in a survey of fifty high

[23] Fay Riley, "Grouping Gives Each Child A Chance," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 58 (August, 1956), p. 51.

schools in sixteen states sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation, offered a plan whereby schools with less than one hundred in the graduating class would consolidate into a comprehensive high school. A large school is then able to offer the type of program which he is proposing. Dr. Conant suggests three ability levels in the curriculum. Each level has its own curriculum which is tailor-made to fit the needs of that particular group. This plan not only provides for the needs of the gifted, but it provides for the slow learner as well.

Good Buy, Mr. Chips?

JUNE DIEMER
Napa, California

TEENAGERS bring into the classroom an entirely different attitude than their parents did a generation ago, and it is grief to the teacher who expects the student to act as the teacher did when *he* went to school. Too much has happened. A new approach to raising a child has produced a different child. These students bring their Bill of Rights with them to school. They have their right to be heard, their right to their own opinion, their right to question authority and facts. A child who has spent his life being allowed to experience and make decisions, expects this freedom everywhere—school being no exception. And where, particularly in junior and senior high schools, in our day it was more the practice to just put the material in front of the student and expect him to memorize it, calling upon his habits of respect, obedience, and unquestioning acceptance, it is today the teacher who is called upon —called upon to be increasingly inventive, convincing, and tolerant. As the perspective on knowledge itself changed with the dropping of a bomb, so the teaching of knowledge must change; as the student has changed, so the teacher must.

Students are more experienced than they were a generation ago. Their whole early environment has been one which encouraged early learning; even their toys were educational. Their actual intelligence quotients may be no higher than their parents', but they have matured socially in a shorter period of time; they are better able to take care of themselves; they have been freer to explore wider areas and more situations earlier, and they are more

prepared to make decisions based on more experiences. And through the particular medium of television they have been exposed to a vast amount of education, whether good or bad. They are more selective, more critical, and therefore, more intelligent—assuming that intelligence means the child's knowing how to handle experience and knowledge.

A more intelligent student requires a more intelligent teacher, and here also the assumption is that intelligence means the teacher's ability to handle knowledge and experience. But what happened to the teacher's command of his information on August 12, 1945? Could he ever again stand in front of a class and say, "This is what you'll need to know"? We no longer represent a stable society. You may question a teacher's decisions of what is important for the student to learn, and there is a much greater chance that what a student learns today may be obsolete tomorrow. Students sense this vagueness and they question and resist.

There was a time, not too long ago, when a teacher could teach successfully, equipped only with his subject-matter knowledge. Much information then was static and the student learned statically. To put information before a student now and simply expect him to learn unquestioningly is wishful thinking. Teenagers today do not "buy" readily.

In addition to their awareness of the continuing temporariness of affairs, international and personal, particularly with military service facing the boys, which fills them with restlessness and impatience, and a belief that they don't really have *time* to learn, teenagers are bringing to the classroom another attitude which is a direct carry-over from infancy.

"Self-Demand" has come from the crib to the classroom. This was a style of infant feeding which millions of American parents ascribed to, whereby the infant was fed according to the schedule he set for himself. It was in direct contrast to the "Schedule Method" which immediately preceded Self-Demand and which prescribed that the baby should be given a bottle on schedule, whether he wanted or needed it, on the hours around the clock at exactly ten, two, four, and six. The Schedule Baby met the needs of the schedule; the Self-Demand Baby let the bottle fit his need.

Self-Demand, which recognized the new born baby as an individual with individual needs different possibly than the needs of other babies, and which is still the principal pattern in child raising, was not limited strictly to the demands of nutritional appetite; it was carried over to many desires, and parents were con-

tinually on the look-out for what they might interpret as being needs which they as parents felt obliged to direct and meet. And the infant grown to teenager expects no change in the ratio. It is the student, he feels, whose needs must be met by the teacher: the student is not in the classroom to meet the needs of the teacher. Only defeat faces the teacher who attempts to force information without first "selling" his students on the need, as forcing children to memorize at the threat of failure, punishment, or insult is defeat.

The real demand on the teacher today is not so much in managing the overcrowded classroom, not in physically surviving the stacks of papers each night. The real demand is in overcoming the resistance he faces. More and more papers and bulletins and books are written on discipline and all with some hope that the student will do what the teacher tells him without noisy argument. But the difficulty, the strain, is not in disciplining the student for lack of cooperation, but in breaking down the resistance of the potential learner. The role has reversed itself in the classroom, and the teacher, because he has students who have grown up with rights to question and rights to resist what they feel no need for, is often on the defensive. The teacher finds himself today less and less a source of information and more and more a stimulus to learning, and while he can't stop being a source, he can't teach successfully if that's all he is.

Teachers do not like to regard themselves as salesmen or showmen, and yet teaching, now, requires the utmost of persuasive skills if they wish their students to learn, not just so that they can teach. But how *does* a salesman get his customer to buy? How does he convince his customer that he *needs* his product? Can he succeed without knowing his customer, without making plans beforehand to break down buyer resistance? A good salesman seizes the exact moment when the customer has finished answering his own questions about the product, has finished investigating his own experience, or lack if it, with this product, and will either accept or reject it, depending of course upon its cost and the customer's need. Capitalizing on the moment of sale—timing and showmanship—are techniques equally of successful teaching and successful salesmanship, for the teacher in recognizing the exact moment and using whatever devices his ingenuity permits him, even being willing to sacrifice his own concept of himself as an adult in front of children to get his point across is, here, little different than the salesman in selling his product. And if there is no buying there has been no selling; if there is no learning there has been no teaching.

But while the technique is similar, the profit to salesman and teacher is different. To the salesman it is money, and the satisfaction of having made a sale. To some teachers is is only money, but to the teacher who makes a successful sale, the profit is the student's learning. The burden of proof of performance which used to be entirely on the student is now also on the teacher—on the teacher first, and then on the student. It's up to the teacher to break down the student's resistance without using high pressure techniques, for high pressure methods are dead—in the classroom and out. Customers, in the classroom and out, are more intelligent and high pressure methods are an insult to intelligence. You don't get any lasting learning nor do you get repeat sales from people who may eventually feel they were talked into something they didn't need. The buyer is conviced by the salesman only at the consent of the customer. We no longer try to get people to buy without thinking. The "Pitch" is directed at the *needs* of the customer and can be changed many ways to fit many different customers.

The total effect then of this attitude, this difference in student-teacher relationship where the balance of power frequently swings in favor of the student, is felt primarily by the teacher, who either succeeds or fails depending on whether or not he recognizes the difference, and whether or not he is capable of and willing to use the techniques necessary to teach in the face of resistance, whether or not he is willing to concede that it is he, the teacher, now, who must come to the student.

For this group of teenagers is only the first of a long line of children that we look forward to seeing in school, who also were raised on Self-Demand, who also have been treated as individuals with individual personalities, needs, rights, opinions, and problems equal in importance to their parents'. We've come a long way from the Old World tradition of child raising which dictated that children should be seen and not heard, and it's questionable whether we will ever again revert to the raising of children with the rod rather than with understanding. But in the meantime, the first generation of teenagers which represents the product of the new child raising theories, a product which was developed to believe it is at last as important as parents and teachers, confronts and challenges and sometimes defeats the classroom teacher.

The teenager is not about to change, to be something he has never been, to react contrary to his own opinion of himself. And in the interest of the teacher's survival it is he who must change,

who must be prepared to meet his classes with a conviction that what he is teaching is worth learning, who must not be above selling his product, who must meet his classes with a sensitivity to his students' needs, who must be equipped less with methods for discipline and more with methods for persuasion, less with personal rigidity and more with personal resiliency, less with the conviction that he has to be boss in order to be teacher, and more with a willingness to concede, more with a desire to accept the student, so that the student can accept him, so the student can learn, so the teacher can teach.

The Teaching of Morality in the Public School

EDWARD LOCKE
Brooklyn, New York

IN THE sphere of ethics, one can almost hear the cry "Hold on" rebounding through the land. The menace of "unethical" forces and the growth of juvenile delinquency have furthered a belief that public schools must indoctrinate pupils with standards of "decency." It is nevertheless surprising to come across literature written by responsible individuals or organizations which in this matter of ethics contradicts fundamental tenets adhered to by that individual or organization. Liberal principles are flouted because, as far as I can discern, belief prevails that one must not carry these principles too far, one must avoid extremes.[1] Too often one finds that the river beyond the bend is rejected because it seems to lead to the edge of the earth. But what if an America is waiting?

I hold that the teaching of dogma in the public schools is to be rejected. For every pupil, a new America does lie in wait. Consider the stand of an organization which propounds the separation of church and state and insists that no religious dogma be taught, but advocates the teaching of special ethical doctrines. "Insofar as it ('spiritual values') is understood to signify the teaching of morality, ethics and good citizenship, a deep commitment to such

[1] Logical inconsistency may have values, but carrying logic to its ultimate end is more satisfying in that not only is a sense of unity effected, but man's recourse to reason is once more exerted in the face of what seems to be a growing regard for irrationality. I do not refer to psychologic understanding and possible forgiveness, or to anti-intellectualism; it is rather an assumption, a contrary exertion, of existential attitudes which have heretofore retreated in a world more and more dominated by conflicting and separative forces.

values has been successfully inculcated by our public schools in successive generations of Americans. The public schools must continue to share responsibility for fostering a commitment to these moral values, without presenting or teaching any sectarian or theological sources or sanctions for such values."[2] The primary principle for the separation of church and state advocated by this group is that religion is a matter of private conscience and should meet with no state interference. But are not one's ethical values just as cherished, as sacred to one as one's religion? If the state cannot impose in any way upon private religious beliefs, does it have the right to offend something equally a matter of private conscience? Grant state control of religion, and you grant terrible restriction; grant state control of ethical beliefs, and you grant dictatorship.

It may be argued that in a democracy there is a hard core of basic moral tenets and habits on which all agree. But the arguments which refute the teaching as dogma of a "basic core of religion" refute this concept as well. First, there is the belief in the necessity of a free conscience, a right to think for one's self. What if one disagrees with the basic core? Is not the basic core itself sectarian? Must all children be told dogmatically that what most Americans believe is correct? No one may appreciate the values he holds most dear unless he is given the opportunity to consider them contrary in a fair light, and the recent experiences of prisoners of war in Korea proved that the best match for an argument is comprehension of what is said, not blind affirmation of one's belief and then blind breakdown.

The problem must not be oversimplified, however. Ethical values require, as much as possible, justification, or they have little cogency. In this, I do not see how one can avoid being sectarian. If one abstracts common ethical beliefs from John Stuart Mill and John Dewey, one must choose between justifications, for they differ in this respect. It would be interesting to see an enumeration of the ethical doctrines supposedly comprising the content of the hard core. Principles which go beyond platitudes would without doubt involve political and social doctrines. No one, as far as I know, has yet advocated the teaching as dogma of the platforms of the Democratic or Republican parties.

Again, ethics taught in a vacuum leads to a vacuous mind. Pupils must see: 1. the interrelationship of their various beliefs;

[2] "Religion and the public school," statements of policy and position jointly adopted by the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council, Jan. 1956.

2. the consequences in real and possible action. Here one has grounds for conflicting opinions. The subject of euthanasia requires a series of postulates, objections, reasonings, etc. It cannot be subsumed under a few ethical platitudes.

But suppose one could somehow find beliefs to which no one objected. In a typical city in the United States, the statements "Love thy neighbor," "Be kind to animals," "All men are brothers," would quite probably find no opposition. However, even if no one disagreed, the door must be left open for students to disagree. The moment one refuses to examine "All men are brothers" critically (or what is the same thing, putting the official force of the school behind it and branding it as "correct"),[3] and propounds it as dogma, one rejects the free play of mind so necessary in a democracy. Indeed, the school becomes a defender of the status quo. If one claims that democracy is impossible without adherence to this belief, it may be pointed out that concepts of democracy differ, that imperfect democracies often exist in spite of important defects, and that all men have the right to prefer dictatorship.

I do not say that nothing should be insisted upon in the school. Obviously, the concepts of fair play and authority of the teacher, to name only two, must form the foundation of action if things are to continue peaceably. Also, in order to act at all, children must have beliefs of some sort. The child should be educated, however, to the fact that education is a continual process, and that he has the right to mentally reject along the way or as an adult any of the institution's principles and procedures which confront him.

The argument has been advanced that society is justified in ensuring its own continuance, and that therefore teachers must inculcate in the students belief in the basic principles on which the society rests. This assertion, it should be seen, can be used with as must justification by a Hitler as by a Jefferson. Certainly society must protect itself by laws, armies, etc., and has the duty to pass

[3] Certain dangers arise when the schools become partisan. Every teacher has a right to express his personal opinion, but when the school takes sides, the teacher will tend to become part of that partisanship. To the extent that the teacher not merely presents the school's arguments, but becomes indebted to the school and feels obligated to devalue his own views, to that extent he is following a "party line." Men who depend for a living on an institution are not likely to cross that institution, or argue strongly for opposing principles. The teacher then betrays the very quality which marks one a good teacher—the independent pursuit of truth. Also, agreeing with the school's policies may become a qualification for instructorship. Lest all this seem too improbable, especially since the school's directors, being "democratic," will espouse views almost always coinciding with those of the teacher, consider the belief in equality of opportunity. If the school propounds this doctrine, all teachers who believe in inheritance of wealth must renounce their beliefs or argue in class against a position they officially represent. Clearly, this presents an intolerable but possible situation, and one that can be solved only by the school's refusal to become sectarian. Lastly, the teaching of dogma advocated by an institution will tend to be taught dogmatically. All the force of officialdom will tend to ignore opposing positions, and to assume as correct the institution's beliefs. The dogmatic teaching of dogma is a possibility too perilous to overlook, and must be considered in and underlie our thinking.

on its traditions. But these traditions often become stale or invalid. Pupils in a democracy should be able to advance new concepts of government. Pupils should understand that one is free to advocate change even if a basic premise would be altered.

Society does have the duty to protect the freedom of the child's mind and the capacity for growth in the child. Is it, then, restricted to a nihilism in which nothing is assured, nothing is propounded as true? In order to restrain no man with dogma, must anarchy reign? Let us carry the principles advocated thus far to their logical conclusion: *nothing* is taught as dogma. Contrary arguments in ethics are presented as fairly as possible, as they are in history, physics, political science, etc., when controversial points arise. Respect is given to the mass of professional opinion and to the rebel. We find here that one principle is being adhered to—each child must make up his own mind (for the most part, tentatively, eventually). This concept might be characterized as "dogma," and we would have to reject it on the grounds already discussed. But let us consider the contrary: "each child must have his mind made up for him"—this contradicts the freedom of conscience we are trying to preserve. Also, each child may decide he would like to have his mind made up for him, but this decision is actually a consequence of an initial making up of his own mind.

We cannot without self-contradiction, therefore, operate on any principle but liberty of choice. To do otherwise would be to act dictatorially, and we are interested here in democratic education. The question immediately arises, since choice is being discussed, "Should the schools dogmatically attribute a greater value to truth than to falsity?" After all, if the child is allowed freedom to think for himself, should not his decision be based on truth? I do not believe the value of truth should be considered as dogmatic. In the first place, it is improbable that any one would base his actions on what he himself believed to be false. From the standpoint of theory, the basic answer is that for the teacher to assert the necessity of falsehood would be a contradiction in terms, for the statement "Falsehood is necessary" would itself have to be regarded as false. The teacher must begin with the idea that, for teaching to be possible at all, adherence to the ideal of truth is necessary. As far as the method for attaining truth is concerned, the only way to avoid dogma is to appeal to reason. To advocate by reason methods for attaining truth other than inquiry and intelligent reasoning

would be contradictory, and, of course, ruinous in a democracy.[4] I see no other way of respecting individuality of mind than to point up alternative theories to reason, but to use reason as one tool in judging the alternatives. But this takes us far afield.

We may seem to have left the problem of morality behind, but the point of the argument is that what applies to one field applies to another, or at least, one must test the applications. Freedom must be free to assert the force of its own premises in order to preserve its essential quality. That the child should be allowed to form his own judgments, that he should follow the ideal of truth, and that reasoning power must be involved in this pursuit, are the maximum, not minimum, an official institution like the public school may impose upon young minds and still preserve democratic growth. The only way democracy has of perpetuating its freshness and best traditions is to provide education for all, but dogmas for none.

What Kinds of Accidents Do Teenagers Have?*

LILLIAN HAYGOOD
Florence, Alabama

THE AREA OF safety had been spotted during the exploratory period. The interest and readiness for this unit grew out of our daily news period. A teenage boy, the son of a teacher, was shot to death by another teenager as they examined a new gun. In the same weekend a fourteen year old boy in an adjoining county was killed while crossing a fence during a hunting trip. The following Wednesday, a teacher's brother was drowned due to the capsizing of a boat at Wheeler Dam.

A difficult situation had arisen. I didn't want to lose the opportunity of using natural leads into the unit, yet we were not finished with the unit on "How the Teen Ager Lives with His Family." From side conversations, it was evident that some of the boys were thinking we should drop our present unit and jump

[4] I do not of course contend that reason may by itself decide everything, or can be or ought to be separated completely from other aspects of personality. But I do assert its value as the essential method in the common pursuit of truth. For a more complete discussion of its values, cf. Sidney Hook's *Education for Modern Man* (New York, Dial, 1946), especially the chapter "The Centrality of Method."

*This is one of a series of reports on units used by successful teachers which might be helpful for other teachers.

into the safety problem. So during a planning period, I encouraged their thinking to come out into the open. Ideas, questions, and much critical thinking were exchanged. We came out with two ways of handling the situation. One was to redirect some of our work on "Living with the Family": to emphasize, more specifically, the necessity of realizing parental responsibility. The Lexington boys were examing the gun without permission, while their parents were at church. The Colbert County boy had gone hunting alone, while his parents were away from home. We branched out to think about other activities which parents had a duty to guide and if necessary make some rules. This technique partially took care of the immediate interest without side tracking our present unit. In addition to this, we decided to keep a clipping book of all the accidents involving teenagers and to share these during the news period. These activities also provided a lead directly from one unit to another. Deeper insights into safety problems were being developed ahead of the unit.

The beginning of a unit is a difficult time. The pooling, examining, culling and organizing of ideas is a tedious job. The teacher has to be in tune with the emotional climate, to feel the pulse of each participant. She has to reflect and direct thinking. She must have planned ahead in her own thinking and yet be so careful to maintain open mindedness and flexibility as she guides group thinking. The plans actually have to evolve from the group if the unit utilizes democratic and problem solving processes.

To illustrate some of the difficulties involved, I would like to lift some quotes from notes kept during the unit.

Teacher: "I have looked over the questions from the committees and there were over a hundred. I recognized that some of these stemmed from the clipping notebooks, safety materials, and the films we saw Friday. What do you think we should do with these questions? What is our next step?

Donnie: "Divide the questions and give each committee some."

Sue: "There are too many questions. Why don't you pick out the best ones?"

Johnnie: "How do I know I'll get the ones I want?"

Bennie: "Are all those questions different?"

Teacher: "Go a little further Bennie. What do you mean by different?"

Bennie: "Most of my questions were about swimming safety. Were there many about this?"

Mary Lou: "I took most of my questions from those booklets on dangers in cosmetic buying."

Frances: "I've been reading about the dangers of dieting. My doctor put me on a diet last Friday. I don't like it much."

Gerald: "Mr. Steward talked with us Thursday during the 4-H meeting about dangers around the farm. I though this was pretty good myself. I'd like to work on this as part of my 4-H project."

Henry: "Mr. Steward was telling us about how the club members at Lexington felt about Charles Smith's death. I think we should study about gun safety. I know some of the fellows in here want to work on that."

Barbara: "Why don't we let the boys study what they want and the girls do the same?"

Teacher: "You feel that some of the problems would be more suitable for boys and others for girls?"

Barbara: "Yes, I do."

Teacher: "Are there some problems that all of us need to consider?"

Therman: "Couldn't we look over the questions and see? There are several that interest me."

Teacher: "Bennie mentioned an idea similar to this when he asked if all the questions were different or if some of them were related."

Vivia: "Why don't we spend the rest of the period studying those questions in our committees?"

Ruth: "We wouldn't all have a list of them."

Teacher: "I ran a list of them off this morning. There are enough copies for each of you to examine."

Sue: "That's too much work—a hundred questions!"

Teacher: "Sue are you saying that you think a longer period of time should be spent since there are so many questions?"

Sue: "No, not exactly. I just think there are too many questions. We never would get done."

Teacher: "What do you suggest we do?"

Sue: "I don't know."

Teacher: "We do have a suggestion to consider. Several have asked if the questions were different or if some were about the same thing. Bennie, for instance, asked how many questions were about swimming safety. It seems that arranging questions under headings would be one way to begin. How do the rest of you feel about this?"

Sue: "When are we suppose to have this finished?"

Teacher: "Perhaps it would be a good idea to pull together as a group at the end of the period tomorrow and see how we are doing. In the meantime, maybe we can help Sue in finding a way to cut down on the number of questions."

The following day we worked, shared and did more planning. A couple of days later I noticed, while working with Sue's committee that she had accepted the challenge. I sensed that she had completely lost her self in the task at hand. She made sound suggestions as the committee culled, combined and organized under topics. This particular committee was doing an excellent job of using the organizational skills, such as: topic outlining, worked on during the English period for the previous two days.

Four days later, as the committees pulled together their work, the class secretary put these phases on the board:

Recreational Safety	Home Safety
Guns	Kitchen
Boats	Bedrooms
Swimming	Basement
Car	Living room
Hiking	Bathroom
Parties	Porch
Picnics	Yard
	Well

Farm Safety

Farm machinery such as: hay balers, tractors, etc.

School Safety	Community Safety	State and National Safety
Bus	Highway	State Highway Department Functions
Halls	Sanitation	Fire prevention regulations
Classroom	Fire Prevention	Consumer protection
Stairs	Buying safety	State Health Department Functions
Gym	Traffic rules	National Safety Council Functions
Playground		
Cafeteria		

I think a briefer way to share the other stages of the unit would be to highlight some of the work under each heading. The same kind of processes used in beginning of the unit were used throughout the study.

Purposes and Outcomes:

We ran into this stage of the work immediately after we had listed the various sub-topics or phases on the board. In fact the

question, "What are we going to do about these problems?" kept popping up as the small committees worked on the questions.

After careful work we listed these outcomes:

A better understanding of some of the teenage safety hazards.

A better understanding of how to have a safer home, school, community, state and nation.

A better understanding of how community, state and national agencies help with safety.

Activities

In planning our activities, we again used a measuring stick. We wanted activities that we could see, hear, feel and do. Below are listed some of our activities:

1. *Seeing* films, filmstrips and other visual aids.
2. *Reading,* studying and doing research from printed materials.
3. *Making* a survey to see the types of accident happening in our room and school.
4. *Planning* first aid kit.
5. *Making* warning signs and safety signs.
6. *Analyzing* advertisements in connection with cosmetics, dieting, patent medicines, etc.
7. *Writing* to state and federal governments and to the National Safety Council for materials.
8. *Collecting* statistics on home accidents.
9. *Demonstrating* how to handle fire arms.
10. *Debating* topics such as: "Are Present Day Cars Safer or Less Safe Than the Model T Ford?"
11. *Making* posters illustrating safety habits and hazards for the different types of recreation.
12. *Making* a chart indicating the county, state and national departments which have safety duties.
13. *Making* a survey of the hazards in and around the school.
14. *Working* out plans for eliminating these hazards.
15. *Studying* the newspapers to see the types of accidents in the area.
16. *Interviewing* the lunch room worker, the bus drivers, the principals, and other teachers.
17. *Listening* to the state highway patrolman. Talking with him about teenage safety problems.[1]

[1] Mr. Lightfoot had to cancel his visit due to illness, but sent written information.

18. *Listening* to the North Florence Fire Chief.[2]
19. *Listening* to reports of special research. (Discussion following.)
20. *Listening* to panels. (Discussion following.)
21. *Inviting* members of other groups in to help us think through certain school problems.
22. *Constructing* bar and line graphs to show data gathered such as, a chart showing the proportion of tax money going for safety.
23. *Painting* friezes to share information.
24. *Reading* poems, stories and biographies of people connected with safety.
25. *Writing* an original skit to share information.
26. *Writing* safety themes to enter into 4-H contest.
27. *Taking* first aid course.
28. *Working* out a first aid demonstration to be shared in 4-H meeting.
29. *Working* out a Quiz program to be shared in 4-H meeting.
30. *Taking* advantage of the state's School fire inspector's visit. He invited a couple of boys to go over the school plant with him.
31. *Planning*, sharing, and evaluating continuously.

This list is not inclusive but does show the types of activities used.

In addition to and in connection with activities, I would like to pull out from the 3 unit progress reports sent to parents, some of the subject matter skills worked on during the unit. These skills were studied as they were needed. Sometimes as a part of the Core period; at times special periods were set aside for intensive work as needed. Of course, this cannot be inclusive or it would result in a course of study. It has been included to illustrate that skills are definitely a part of the core.

Discussion Skills

1. *Speaking* clearly, audibly, and pleasingly. (Such as, work on errors, voice tones, pronunciation keys, etc.)
2. *Giving* facts from authorities on the subject and how to use these. (Such as, how to introduce the authority.)
3. *Setting* up standards for discussion. (Such as, listen attentively when some one is speaking; make your points interesting and to the point.)

[2] A small committee visited the Chief.

4. *Summarizing* a discussion. (Such as, arranging points in chronological order; under headings, pro and con., etc.)
5. *Using* a check sheet to evaluate group discussion. (Such as, did each member of the group stick to the topic?; did anyone monopolize the discussion?)
6. *Making* decisions. (Such as, listing advantages in one column and the disadvantages in another.)
7. *Making* explanations. (Such as, analyzing the question, determining exactly what information is required.)
8. *Leading* a discussion. (Such as, ways of pulling group members into the discussion; courteous ways of keeping the group on the subject, etc.)
9. *Gathering* materials by reading (contents, index, title page, copy right notice, preface, appendix, etc.)
10. *Taking notes.* (Such as, writing ideas in own words, how to use a quote.)
11. *Outlining.* (Such as, classifying notes, topics and sub-topics, relating facts and ideas, etc.)
12. *Reporting.* (Such as getting facts straight, including materials directly on topic, arranging materials sensibly, speaking clearly, using vivid, colorful words, posture, voice tone, etc.)
13. *Observing* and describing. (Such as, how to choose important details, use of picture making words, etc.)

Listening

1. *Listening* to direction. (Such as, reproducing, orally, the essential facts of the directions.)
2. *Rating* listeners. (Such as, observing each other as to: continuity of discussion; evidence of changed ideas; evidence of constantly jumping into discussion, etc.)
3. *Telephoning.* (Such as, ability to bring back correct information.)
4. *Listening* discriminatingly. (Such as, evidence of thoughtful questions.)
5. *Listening,* ability to help the leader in guiding discussion.
6. *Listening* for points. (Such as, comparing notes at the end of a discussion.)

Writing

1. *Writing* business letters. (Such as, letters of inquiry, letters of request, thank you letters, etc.)

2. *Writing* themes for publication. (Such as, accuracy, revising and re-writing.)
3. *Writing* skits. (Such as, planning descriptions, picturing, etc.)
4. *Writing* reports. (Such as, outlining, note taking, etc.)
5. *Writing* summaries of work
6. *Writing* unit progress reports.

Reading

1. *Learning* to read with a definite purpose.
2. *Working* on enlarging vocabulary.
3. *Learning* to do research for specific information.
4. *Learning* to search for the central idea in a paragraph.
5. *Learning* to concentrate.
6. *Learning* to read in large units.

I would like to have pulled out some definite arithmetical skills, science skills, art skills and other related subjects, but this unit would be too lengthy.

There were many skills used in core work. Some of them a definite part of core, others related. A two hour block of time was devoted to core. I would like to state here definite skills periods were also a part of the schedule. The core work chief relation to the rest of the day's work was that it furnished purpose, reason, and need for learning the skills.

Culminating Activity

The group took charge of a 4-H club meeting and presented: a skit, a first aid demonstration, and a panel. They were able to share with all of the Junior High School boys and girls and also to cooperate with the 4-H leaders since the year's schedule called for some time to be devoted to safety.

Evaluation

Many types of evaluation were used throughout the unit, such as:

(Pupil-Teacher)
Continuous oral evaluations
Written evaluation at intervals
Progress reports of unit to parents
Pupil evaluation sheet
Teacher evaluation sheet
Discussion diagrams

Individual conferences
Check sheets on various projects
Individual folders

(Teacher)

The teacher used a clip board for keeping a written, day by day, progress report. She also kept 3 by 5 cards for jotting down observations and direct comments made by the boys and girls.

The teacher sent a letter supplement with the report card each time.

(Parent)

Parents reached a 75% return on the parent evaluation sheets. Telephoning and letters were the chief means of communication. P.T.A. meetings also provided some contact. Home visitation on limited basis was used. However, many of the mothers have outside jobs which made visitation inconvenient.

Book Reviews

FINN, JAMES D., *The Audio-Visual Equipment Manual,* Dryden Press, New York, N. Y.: 1957. 363 pp.

The Audio-Visual Equipment Manual should be a very helpful book for anyone working with audio-visual aids. The principal of the school would probably want a copy of this manual as a reference for his teachers. The director of audio-visual materials could receive considerable help from the use of this manual in his work.

There are four major areas presented. The first section deals with projectors, the second section with record players and radio receivers, the third section deals with tape recorders and the fourth section deals with tachistoscopes and miscellaneous devices. Within each section there is considerable information dealing with the theories of projection, the use and care of equipment, and an especially good section dealing with the maintenance. An excellent use of illustrations including many diagrams and pictures make the operation of audio-visual aids relatively simple even for the inexperienced person. The book is well indexed and it is easy to find descriptions of the most common types of audio-visual equipment.

Dr. Edgar Dale was general editor for the manual and it is well prepared to be used in connection with any of the texts for courses in audio-visual instruction.

There is an excellent bibliography which should furnish sources of material for those who wish to continue reading on the various areas discussed.

D. G. TARBET

HAYES, E. N., Editor, *Directory for Exceptional Children,* 2nd. Edition, Porter Sargent Publisher, 11 Beacon St., Boston 8, Mass., 256 pp. 1956, $4.00 cloth, $3.00 paper.

The *Directory for Exceptional Children* is a useful listing of the available facilities for satisfying the unique needs of exceptional children. Educators, psychologists, family doctors, and others who are concerned with the exceptional child, will find this book an important reference on the existing services in the area of exceptionality. Anyone who has been asked by an anxious parent "Where can I get help for my child?" will welcome a book that lists schools,

hospitals, clinics—both private and state—that are equipped to handle particular areas of exceptionality.

The book does not attempt to evaluate the schools or other facilities but it does give in one place, a reasonably complete listing of state and private services for exceptional children.

R. B. HUGHES

HUNNICUTT, C. W. AND WILLIAM J. IVERSON, *Research in the Three R's,* Harper and Brothers, New York, 1958.

It is difficult to understand why more material of this type is not now in use in programs of teacher education both at the preservice and inservice level. Here in one volume is most of the important research dealing with the teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic. As is usually true of books of "readings" some of the material has been abridged and most of it is summarized. The careful student of any specific aspect would refer back to the original publication for critical analysis of the research. Nevertheless the quality of the selection is sufficiently high to make this unnecessary for the typical classroom teacher who is most immediately concerned with the results obtained.

Greater use of original research results will require more attention in our teacher training programs to the reading and interpretation of statistical reports. Perhaps the ready availability of collections such as this will help to encourage this increased literacy on the part of the classroom teacher. S. M. HOLTON

MILLER, ARTHUR S., *Racial Discrimination and Private Education: A Legal Analysis,* The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1957. $3.50.

This book seems to represent a careful analysis of the legal problems involved in the integration of private schools in the South. Most of the action in this area has occurred at the college rather than at the secondary level.

The analysis deals with the headings: I. The Private School System in America, II. Governmental Sanctions against Integration, III. Private Sanctions against Integration, IV. The Public Nature of Private Education, and V. Limitations in Grants and Gifts. The final chapter gives a statement of principles which would be quite useful to anyone trying to understand the complexity of the whole problem. S. M. HOLTON

Free and Inexpensive Learning Materials, Division of Surveys and Field Services, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn., 1959. $1.50.

The ninth edition of this popular aid contains over four thousand entries of which approximately a third are new or revised. Few items listed costs more than fifty cents. If it is not available on every teacher's desk, there should be at least one copy available in the professional library in every school building.

★ PRINTING
★ BINDING
★ ENGRAVING
★ LITHOGRAPHING

A complete Printing Service

Catering to the requirements of discriminating individuals. We are firm in the belief that North Carolina business, and educational institutions, are entitled to the best. Our more than seventy-three years of balanced growth in machines and know-how, with increased services and prompt delivery, are an advantage to you in planned printing. Let us work with you.

THE Seeman Printery INC.
in DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA *since 1885*

OUR ORGANIZATION OF PRINTING CRAFTSMEN TAKE UNUSUAL INTEREST IN PRODUCING GOOD PRINTING

Chicago Public Library
Ella Flagg Young Room for Teachers
78 East Washington St.
Chicago 2, Ill.
2 COPIES